

Dear Councillors

I'm disappointed that we have not been able to achieve verbal deputations to the Development Management Committee yet. It appears to residents that insufficient priority has been given to this matter – and that whilst ceremonial events have taken place with Councillors and members of the public, it is still not possible for Councillors and other deputies to be able to speak to the Committee and answer questions for clarification. I hope that the Committee will push for a speedy resolution to this issue.

Turning to the application being considered, I have spoken at length to local residents about this application. It is generally the case that residents understand that new green field developments are required to meet our need for housing, but that this application falls short of sustainable development on a number of matters.

It will be important for the committee to weigh up the approval of this application against all of these issues – I have done so, and believe it will be possible for the applicant to bring forward a better scheme in a relatively short time that meets the national and local policies we set. My recommendation to the committee is that the application should be refused for the following reasons:

- Space standards. As described in detail in Mr Storey's deputation, it is the case that many properties on the development do not comply with national space standards. The case officer also stated that 30% of properties do not meet space standards. Whilst it would be understandable in a conversion scheme to need some flexibility, the committee would be doing future residents a serious disservice to approve a scheme that did not have 100% compliance with these standards.
- Garage sizes. According to the information presented, not all of the garages meet the HBC Parking Supplementary Planning Document standard dimensions, and therefore should not count as parking spaces. This will leave the development short of parking overall. The application should be refused until such time it complies with the parking standards.
- Southern access. The developer has chosen not to connect the southern end of the development with the east/west footpath from Havant to Emsworth, which could substantially improve safety and walking/cycling connectivity. The Design and Access statement correctly identifies this area as requiring safeguarding for future infrastructure, but this should not preclude a walking/cycling connection until such time as this area is needed for other purposes – which may be many years in the future.
- The assessment of sustainable transport options is both incorrect and insufficient. The proposals for bus access are incorrect – the 27 runs only four times a day, so cannot be considered an option for sustainable transport. The 700 westbound bus stop is over 1000m from the centre of the development, and therefore is not within the recommended 800m

walking distance to such facilities. The site therefore as presented is not connected to a bus route – this issue could be resolved by adding the footpath from my point above.

- The assessment of Warblington Station providing sustainable transport also shows a lack of awareness of the local situation. The proposal to add a footbridge at the station will considerably improve the situation, allowing many more people to confidently use the station. It is therefore disappointing that the Highway Authority have not asked for a further contribution to add to the over £600,000 it is already holding for that purpose. It would be a far better transport improvement than minor tinkering with road layouts (which is proposed).
- The lack of consideration of walking and cycling is very disappointing – the officer’s report states in 7.78 that this development provides ‘improved walking and cycling routes in the area’. I can find no proposals within the documents to make any improvements! This could be a highly attractive location for travelling on foot or bicycle to schools, shops and community facilities, but that opportunity is being wasted.
- The east/west spine road. As identified in the report, it is vital that the east/west road through the site is adopted ready for future development to the east. Rather than making a condition that the road be built ‘adoption ready’, it should be a condition that the road is adopted, thereby safeguarding this important future route to Southleigh.
- Construction management. It is disappointing that the Traffic Team have not asked for funding for potential Traffic Regulation Orders that may be required. The site is near a large secondary school, and a major A27 junction. It will therefore be important that accesses can be maintained, and construction vehicles use appropriate routes and parking places prior to entering the worksite. I recommend that the committee adds a condition that a £5000 contribution is made available to the Traffic Team for any TROs necessary to maintain safe access during both the construction and occupation phases.

In summary, I believe that these shortcomings are sufficiently serious to warrant a refusal of the application. However, they can be overcome by the developer, and by working with Ward Councillors and local residents, a scheme can be arrived at that meets the developers aspirations without comprising on national and local standards.